

The exact formula for neutrino oscillations

Massimo Blasone^{a,c}, Peter A. Henning^b and Giuseppe Vitiello^{c*}

^a *Blackett Laboratory, Imperial College, Prince Consort Road,
London SW7 2BZ, U.K.*

^b *Institut für Kernphysik, TH Darmstadt, Schloßgartenstraße 9,
D-64289 Darmstadt, Germany*

^c *Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università and INFN, Gruppo Collegato, Salerno
I-84100 Salerno, Italy*

Abstract

We present the exact formula for neutrino oscillations. By resorting to recent results of Quantum Field Theory of fermion mixing, we work out the Green's function formalism for mixed neutrinos. The usual quantum mechanical Pontecorvo formula is recovered in the relativistic limit.

P.A.C.S.: 14.60.Pq, 11.15.Tk, 12.15.Ff

The mixing of mass eigenstates plays a relevant role in high energy physics: the family mixing problem of the standard model [1], neutrino oscillations [2] and the solar neutrino problem [3], thermal field theory [4] in hot hadronic matter are some examples where it must be considered. However, a thorough theoretical analysis of the mixing of fields in Quantum Field Theory has not been carried out till ref. [5].

In this paper we present the exact formula for neutrino oscillations: this is done by studying the Green's functions for mixed fermions. We show that in the study of neutrino oscillations it is necessary to take into account the full structure of the Heisenberg vacuum for mixed fermions, which exhibits a very rich condensate-coherent state structure [5,6].

The result is an oscillation formula which differs from the usual one in the non-relativistic region, a result which was partially achieved in ref. [5]. With the present analysis of the full vacuum effects, we get, together with the energy dependent "squeezing" factor of the amplitude studied in ref. [5], also an additional term with a different oscillatory frequency: resonance is then possible also in vacuum for particular values of the masses and/or of the momentum, thus leading to a suppression or to an enhancement of the conversion probability.

We consider the mixing problem for two Dirac fields with a bilinear interaction Lagrangian. We denote the fields with ν_e and ν_μ (space-time dependence suppressed), referring thus explicitly to electron and muon neutrinos: however, the following results are valid for general Dirac fields. The Lagrangian we consider has the general form

*e-mail: m.blasone@ic.ac.uk, P.Henning@gsi.de, vitiello@physics.unisa.it

$$\mathcal{L} = \bar{\nu}_e (i \not{\partial} - m_e) \nu_e + \bar{\nu}_\mu (i \not{\partial} - m_\mu) \nu_\mu - m_{e\mu} (\bar{\nu}_e \nu_\mu + \bar{\nu}_\mu \nu_e) . \quad (1)$$

Generalization to a higher number of flavors is straightforward. This Lagrangian can be fully diagonalized by substituting for the fields [2]

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_e(x) &= \nu_1(x) \cos \theta + \nu_2(x) \sin \theta \\ \nu_\mu(x) &= -\nu_1(x) \sin \theta + \nu_2(x) \cos \theta , \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where θ is the mixing angle and $m_e = m_1 \cos^2 \theta + m_2 \sin^2 \theta$, $m_\mu = m_1 \sin^2 \theta + m_2 \cos^2 \theta$, $m_{e\mu} = (m_2 - m_1) \sin \theta \cos \theta$. ν_1 and ν_2 therefore are non-interacting, free fields, anticommuting with each other at any space-time point. They are explicitly given by

$$\nu_i(x) = V^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, r} \left[u_{\mathbf{k}, i}^r e^{-i\omega_{\mathbf{k}, i} t} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}, i}^r + v_{-\mathbf{k}, i}^r e^{i\omega_{\mathbf{k}, i} t} \beta_{-\mathbf{k}, i}^{r\dagger} \right] e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}}, \quad i = 1, 2 . \quad (3)$$

Here and in the following we use $t \equiv x_0$, when no misunderstanding arises. The vacuum for the α_i and β_i operators is denoted by $|0\rangle_{1,2}$: $\alpha_{\mathbf{k}, i}^r |0\rangle_{1,2} = \beta_{\mathbf{k}, i}^r |0\rangle_{1,2} = 0$. The anticommutation relations, completeness and orthonormality relations are the usual ones (see ref. [5]).

The fields ν_e and ν_μ are thus completely determined through eq.(2). In order to circumvent the difficulty of the construction of a Fock space for the mixed fields, which has been emphasized in a number of publications, e.g. [7,8], it is useful to expand the flavor fields ν_e and ν_μ in the same basis as ν_1 and ν_2 ,

$$\nu_e^\alpha(x) = G_\theta^{-1}(t) \nu_1^\alpha(x) G_\theta(t) = V^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, r} \left[u_{\mathbf{k}, 1}^{r, \alpha} e^{-i\omega_{\mathbf{k}, 1} t} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}, e}^r(t) + v_{-\mathbf{k}, 1}^{r, \alpha} e^{i\omega_{\mathbf{k}, 1} t} \beta_{-\mathbf{k}, e}^{r\dagger}(t) \right] e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}}, \quad (4)$$

$$\nu_\mu^\alpha(x) = G_\theta^{-1}(t) \nu_2^\alpha(x) G_\theta(t) = V^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, r} \left[u_{\mathbf{k}, 2}^{r, \alpha} e^{-i\omega_{\mathbf{k}, 2} t} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}, \mu}^r(t) + v_{-\mathbf{k}, 2}^{r, \alpha} e^{i\omega_{\mathbf{k}, 2} t} \beta_{-\mathbf{k}, \mu}^{r\dagger}(t) \right] e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}}, \quad (5)$$

where $G_\theta(t) = \exp \left[\theta \int d^3 \mathbf{x} \left(\nu_1^\dagger(x) \nu_2(x) - \nu_2^\dagger(x) \nu_1(x) \right) \right]$ is the generator of the mixing transformations (2) [5]. Notice that the flavor annihilation operator, say $\alpha_{\mathbf{k}, e}^r(t) = \int d^3 \mathbf{x} u_{\mathbf{k}, 1}^{r\dagger} e^{i\omega_{\mathbf{k}, 1} t - i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}} \nu_e(x)$, has contributions *also* from the anti-particle operator $\beta_2^\dagger$ [5]:

$$\alpha_{\mathbf{k}, e}^r(t) = \cos \theta \alpha_{\mathbf{k}, 1}^r + \sin \theta \sum_s \left(u_{\mathbf{k}, 1}^{r\dagger} u_{\mathbf{k}, 2}^s e^{-i(\omega_{\mathbf{k}, 2} - \omega_{\mathbf{k}, 1})t} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}, 2}^s + u_{\mathbf{k}, 1}^{r\dagger} v_{-\mathbf{k}, 2}^s e^{i(\omega_{\mathbf{k}, 1} + \omega_{\mathbf{k}, 2})t} \beta_{-\mathbf{k}, 2}^{s\dagger} \right) . \quad (6)$$

The term containing $u_{\mathbf{k}, 1}^{r\dagger} v_{-\mathbf{k}, 2}^s$, which is non-zero for $m_1 \neq m_2$, has been wrongly missed in the usual treatment of mixing. Relations similar to eq.(6) hold for the other operators [5].

The bilinear mixed term of eq.(1) generates four non-zero two point Green's functions for the mixed fields ν_e , ν_μ . The crucial point is about how to compute these propagators: if one (naively) uses the vacuum $|0\rangle_{1,2}$, one gets an inconsistent result (cf. eq.(14)). Let us show this by defining the propagators as

$$\begin{pmatrix} S_{ee}^{\alpha\beta}(x, y) & S_{\mu e}^{\alpha\beta}(x, y) \\ S_{e\mu}^{\alpha\beta}(x, y) & S_{\mu\mu}^{\alpha\beta}(x, y) \end{pmatrix} \equiv {}_{1,2}\langle 0 | \begin{pmatrix} T [\nu_e^\alpha(x) \bar{\nu}_e^\beta(y)] & T [\nu_\mu^\alpha(x) \bar{\nu}_e^\beta(y)] \\ T [\nu_e^\alpha(x) \bar{\nu}_\mu^\beta(y)] & T [\nu_\mu^\alpha(x) \bar{\nu}_\mu^\beta(y)] \end{pmatrix} | 0 \rangle_{1,2} , \quad (7)$$

where T denotes time ordering. Use of (2) gives S_{ee} in momentum representation as

$$S_{ee}(k_0, \mathbf{k}) = \cos^2 \theta \frac{k + m_1}{k^2 - m_1^2 + i\delta} + \sin^2 \theta \frac{k + m_2}{k^2 - m_2^2 + i\delta}, \quad (8)$$

which is just the weighted sum of the two propagators for the free fields ν_1 and ν_2 . It coincides with the Feynman propagator obtained by resumming (to all orders) the perturbative series

$$S_{ee} = S_e \left(1 + m_{e\mu}^2 S_\mu S_e + m_{e\mu}^4 S_\mu S_e S_\mu S_e + \dots \right) = S_e \left(1 - m_{e\mu}^2 S_\mu S_e \right)^{-1}, \quad (9)$$

where the “bare” propagators are defined as $S_{e/\mu} = (k - m_{e/\mu} + i\delta)^{-1}$. In a similar way, one computes $S_{e\mu}$ and $S_{\mu e}$.

The transition amplitude for an electron neutrino created by $\alpha_{\mathbf{k},e}^{r\dagger}$ at time $t = 0$ going into the same particle at time t , is given by

$$\mathcal{P}_{ee}^r(\mathbf{k}, t) = i u_{\mathbf{k},1}^{r\dagger} e^{i\omega_{k,1}t} S_{ee}^>(\mathbf{k}, t) \gamma^0 u_{\mathbf{k},1}^r, \quad (10)$$

where the spinors u_1 and v_1 form the basis in which the field ν_e is expanded (cf. eq.(4)). Here, $S_{ee}^>$ denotes the unordered Green’s function (or Wightman function): $i S_{ee}^{>\alpha\beta}(t, \mathbf{x}; 0, \mathbf{y}) = {}_{1,2}\langle 0 | \nu_e^\alpha(t, \mathbf{x}) \bar{\nu}_e^\beta(0, \mathbf{y}) | 0 \rangle_{1,2}$. The explicit expression for $S_{ee}^>(\mathbf{k}, t)$ is

$$S_{ee}^{>\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{k}, t) = -i \sum_r \left(\cos^2 \theta e^{-i\omega_{k,1}t} u_{\mathbf{k},1}^{r,\alpha} \bar{u}_{\mathbf{k},1}^{r,\beta} + \sin^2 \theta e^{-i\omega_{k,2}t} u_{\mathbf{k},2}^{r,\alpha} \bar{u}_{\mathbf{k},2}^{r,\beta} \right). \quad (11)$$

The amplitude eq.(10) is independent of the spin orientation and given by

$$\mathcal{P}_{ee}(\mathbf{k}, t) = \cos^2 \theta + \sin^2 \theta |U_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 e^{-i(\omega_{k,2} - \omega_{k,1})t}. \quad (12)$$

For different masses and for $\mathbf{k} \neq 0$, $|U_{\mathbf{k}}|$ is always < 1 [5]. Explicitly,

$$|U_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{r,s} \left| u_{\mathbf{k},2}^{r\dagger} u_{\mathbf{k},1}^s \right|^2 = \left(\frac{\omega_{k,1} + m_1}{2\omega_{k,1}} \right) \left(\frac{\omega_{k,2} + m_2}{2\omega_{k,2}} \right) \left(1 + \frac{|\mathbf{k}|^2}{(\omega_{k,1} + m_1)(\omega_{k,2} + m_2)} \right)^2. \quad (13)$$

Notice that $|U_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 \rightarrow 1$ in the relativistic limit $|\mathbf{k}| \gg \sqrt{m_1 m_2}$: only in this limit the squared modulus of $\mathcal{P}_{ee}(\mathbf{k}, t)$ does reproduce the Pontecorvo oscillation formula.

Of course, it should be $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \mathcal{P}_{ee}(t) = 1$. Instead, one obtains the unacceptable result

$$\mathcal{P}_{ee}(\mathbf{k}, 0^+) = \cos^2 \theta + \sin^2 \theta |U_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 < 1. \quad (14)$$

This means that the *choice of the state* $|0\rangle_{1,2}$ in eq.(7) and in the computation of the Wightman function is *not* the correct one. The reason is that $|0\rangle_{1,2}$ is not the vacuum state for the flavor fields [5]: although the Lagrangian (1) is fully diagonalizable by means of the rotation (2), this transformation does not leave invariant the vacuum $|0\rangle_{1,2}$. The mixing generator G_θ induces on it a $SU(2)$ coherent state structure, resulting in a new state,

$$|0(t)\rangle_{e,\mu} \equiv G_\theta^{-1}(t) |0\rangle_{1,2}, \quad (15)$$

which is the *flavor vacuum*, i.e. the vacuum state for the flavor operators $\alpha_{e/\mu}$, $\beta_{e/\mu}$ [5]: $\alpha_{\mathbf{k},e/\mu}^r(t) |0(t)\rangle_{e,\mu} = \beta_{\mathbf{k},e/\mu}^r(t) |0(t)\rangle_{e,\mu} = 0$. It is a condensate of four different fermion-antifermion pairs, of the form $\alpha_{\mathbf{k},i}^{r\dagger} \beta_{-\mathbf{k},j}^{r\dagger}$, with $i, j = 1, 2$ (see [5] for the explicit form). Its

non-perturbative nature results in the unitary inequivalence with the “perturbative” vacuum $|0\rangle_{1,2}$, in the infinite volume limit [5]. An important point is represented by the time dependence of mixing generator, and consequently of the flavor vacuum. This is not surprising since the flavor states are not mass eigenstates and therefore the Poincaré structure of the flavor vacuum is lacking.

We now show that the correct definition of the Green’s function matrix for the fields ν_e , ν_μ is the one which involves the flavor vacuum $|0\rangle_{e,\mu}$, i.e.

$$\begin{pmatrix} G_{ee}^{\alpha\beta}(x, y) & G_{\mu e}^{\alpha\beta}(x, y) \\ G_{e\mu}^{\alpha\beta}(x, y) & G_{\mu\mu}^{\alpha\beta}(x, y) \end{pmatrix} \equiv {}_{e,\mu}\langle 0(y_0) | \begin{pmatrix} T [\nu_e^\alpha(x) \bar{\nu}_e^\beta(y)] & T [\nu_\mu^\alpha(x) \bar{\nu}_e^\beta(y)] \\ T [\nu_e^\alpha(x) \bar{\nu}_\mu^\beta(y)] & T [\nu_\mu^\alpha(x) \bar{\nu}_\mu^\beta(y)] \end{pmatrix} | 0(y_0) \rangle_{e,\mu}. \quad (16)$$

Notice that here the time argument y_0 (or, equally well, x_0) of the flavor ground state, is chosen to be equal on both sides of the expectation value. Indeed, we observe that transition matrix elements of the type ${}_{e,\mu}\langle 0 | \alpha_e \exp[-iHt] \alpha_e^\dagger | 0 \rangle_{e,\mu}$, where H is the Hamiltonian, do not represent physical transition amplitudes: they actually vanish (in the infinite volume limit) due to the unitary inequivalence of flavor vacua at different times (see below). Therefore the comparison of states at different times necessitates a *parallel transport* of these states to a common point of reference. The definition (16) includes this concept of parallel transport, which is a sort of “gauge fixing”: a rich geometric structure underlying the mixing transformations (2) is thus uncovered. In a forthcoming publication we will discuss these geometrical aspects of field mixing, including Berry phase and gauge structure.

In the case of $\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e$ propagation, we now have (for $\mathbf{k} = (0, 0, |\mathbf{k}|)$):

$$G_{ee}(k_0, \mathbf{k}) = S_{ee}(k_0, \mathbf{k}) + 2\pi i \sin^2 \theta \left[|V_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 (\not{k} + m_2) \delta(k^2 - m_2^2) - |U_{\mathbf{k}}| |V_{\mathbf{k}}| \sum_r (\epsilon^r u_{\mathbf{k},2}^r \bar{v}_{-\mathbf{k},2}^r \delta(k_0 - \omega_2) + \epsilon^r v_{-\mathbf{k},2}^r \bar{u}_{\mathbf{k},2}^r \delta(k_0 + \omega_2)) \right], \quad (17)$$

where we used $\epsilon^r = (-1)^r$ and $|V_{\mathbf{k}}| = \sqrt{1 - |U_{\mathbf{k}}|^2}$. Comparison of eq.(17) with eq.(8) shows that the difference between the full and the perturbative propagators is in the imaginary part.

The Wightman functions for an electron neutrino are $iG_{ee}^{>\alpha\beta}(t, \mathbf{x}; 0, \mathbf{y}) = {}_{e,\mu}\langle 0 | \nu_e^\alpha(t, \mathbf{x}) \bar{\nu}_e^\beta(0, \mathbf{y}) | 0 \rangle_{e,\mu}$, and $iG_{\mu e}^{>\alpha\beta}(t, \mathbf{x}; 0, \mathbf{y}) = {}_{e,\mu}\langle 0 | \nu_\mu^\alpha(t, \mathbf{x}) \bar{\nu}_e^\beta(0, \mathbf{y}) | 0 \rangle_{e,\mu}$. These are conveniently expressed in terms of anticommutators at different times as

$$iG_{ee}^{>\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{k}, t) = \sum_r \left[u_{\mathbf{k},1}^{r,\alpha} \bar{u}_{\mathbf{k},1}^{r,\beta} \left\{ \alpha_{\mathbf{k},e}^r(t), \alpha_{\mathbf{k},e}^{r\dagger} \right\} e^{-i\omega_{k,1}t} + v_{-\mathbf{k},1}^{r,\alpha} \bar{u}_{\mathbf{k},1}^{r,\beta} \left\{ \beta_{-\mathbf{k},e}^{r\dagger}(t), \alpha_{\mathbf{k},e}^{r\dagger} \right\} e^{i\omega_{k,1}t} \right], \quad (18)$$

$$iG_{\mu e}^{>\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{k}, t) = \sum_r \left[u_{\mathbf{k},2}^{r,\alpha} \bar{u}_{\mathbf{k},1}^{r,\beta} \left\{ \alpha_{\mathbf{k},\mu}^r(t), \alpha_{\mathbf{k},e}^{r\dagger} \right\} e^{-i\omega_{k,2}t} + v_{-\mathbf{k},2}^{r,\alpha} \bar{u}_{\mathbf{k},1}^{r,\beta} \left\{ \beta_{-\mathbf{k},\mu}^{r\dagger}(t), \alpha_{\mathbf{k},e}^{r\dagger} \right\} e^{i\omega_{k,2}t} \right]. \quad (19)$$

Here and in the following $\alpha_{\mathbf{k},e}^{r\dagger}$ stands for $\alpha_{\mathbf{k},e}^{r\dagger}(0)$. We now have four distinct transition amplitudes, given by anticommutators of flavor operators at different times:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{ee}^r(\mathbf{k}, t) &\equiv i u_{\mathbf{k},1}^{r\dagger} e^{i\omega_{k,1}t} G_{ee}^{>}(\mathbf{k}, t) \gamma^0 u_{\mathbf{k},1}^r = \left\{ \alpha_{\mathbf{k},e}^r(t), \alpha_{\mathbf{k},e}^{r\dagger} \right\} \\ &= \cos^2 \theta + \sin^2 \theta \left[|U_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 e^{-i(\omega_{k,2} - \omega_{k,1})t} + |V_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 e^{i(\omega_{k,2} + \omega_{k,1})t} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}_{ee}^r(\mathbf{k}, t) &\equiv i v_{-\mathbf{k},1}^{r\dagger} e^{-i\omega_{k,1}t} G_{ee}^>(\mathbf{k}, t) \gamma^0 u_{\mathbf{k},1}^r = \left\{ \beta_{-\mathbf{k},e}^{r\dagger}(t), \alpha_{\mathbf{k},e}^{r\dagger} \right\} \\ &= \epsilon^r |U_{\mathbf{k}}| |V_{\mathbf{k}}| \sin^2\theta \left[e^{i(\omega_{k,2}-\omega_{k,1})t} - e^{-i(\omega_{k,2}+\omega_{k,1})t} \right],\end{aligned}\quad (21)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}_{\mu e}^r(\mathbf{k}, t) &\equiv i u_{\mathbf{k},2}^{r\dagger} e^{i\omega_{k,2}t} G_{\mu e}^>(\mathbf{k}, t) \gamma^0 u_{\mathbf{k},1}^r = \left\{ \alpha_{\mathbf{k},\mu}^r(t), \alpha_{\mathbf{k},e}^{r\dagger} \right\} \\ &= |U_{\mathbf{k}}| \cos\theta \sin\theta \left[1 - e^{i(\omega_{k,2}-\omega_{k,1})t} \right],\end{aligned}\quad (22)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}_{\bar{\mu}e}^r(\mathbf{k}, t) &\equiv i v_{-\mathbf{k},2}^{r\dagger} e^{-i\omega_{k,2}t} G_{\bar{\mu}e}^>(\mathbf{k}, t) \gamma^0 u_{\mathbf{k},1}^r = \left\{ \beta_{-\mathbf{k},\mu}^{r\dagger}(t), \alpha_{\mathbf{k},e}^{r\dagger} \right\} \\ &= \epsilon^r |V_{\mathbf{k}}| \cos\theta \sin\theta \left[1 - e^{-i(\omega_{k,2}+\omega_{k,1})t} \right].\end{aligned}\quad (23)$$

All other anticommutators with $\alpha_e^\dagger$ vanish. The probability amplitude is now correctly normalized: $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \mathcal{P}_{ee}(\mathbf{k}, t) = 1$, and $\mathcal{P}_{\bar{e}e}$, $\mathcal{P}_{\mu e}$, $\mathcal{P}_{\bar{\mu}e}$ go to zero in the same limit $t \rightarrow 0^+$. Moreover,

$$|\mathcal{P}_{ee}^r(\mathbf{k}, t)|^2 + |\mathcal{P}_{\bar{e}e}^r(\mathbf{k}, t)|^2 + |\mathcal{P}_{\mu e}^r(\mathbf{k}, t)|^2 + |\mathcal{P}_{\bar{\mu}e}^r(\mathbf{k}, t)|^2 = 1, \quad (24)$$

as the conservation of the total probability requires. We also note that the above transition probabilities are independent of the spin orientation.

For notational simplicity, we now drop the momentum and spin indices. The momentum is taken to be aligned along the quantization axis, $\mathbf{k} = (0, 0, |\mathbf{k}|)$. It is also understood that antiparticles carry opposite momentum to that of the particles. At time $t = 0$, the vacuum state is $|0\rangle_{e,\mu}$ and the one electron neutrino state is

$$|\nu_e\rangle \equiv \alpha_e^\dagger |0\rangle_{e,\mu} = \left[\cos\theta \alpha_1^\dagger + |U| \sin\theta \alpha_2^\dagger - \epsilon |V| \sin\theta \alpha_1^\dagger \alpha_2^\dagger \beta_1^\dagger \right] |0\rangle_{1,2}. \quad (25)$$

In this state a multiparticle component is present, disappearing in the relativistic limit $|\mathbf{k}| \gg \sqrt{m_1 m_2}$: in this limit the (quantum-mechanical) Pontecorvo state is recovered. The time evolved of $|\nu_e\rangle$ is given by $|\nu_e(t)\rangle = e^{-iHt} |\nu_e\rangle$.

Notice however that the flavor vacuum $|0\rangle_{e,\mu}$ is not eigenstate of the free Hamiltonian H . It “rotates” under the action of the time evolution generator: one indeed finds $\lim_{V \rightarrow \infty} {}_{e,\mu} \langle 0 | 0(t) \rangle_{e,\mu} = 0$. Thus at different times we have unitarily inequivalent flavor vacua (in the limit $V \rightarrow \infty$): this expresses the different particle content of these (coherent) states and it is direct consequence of the fact that flavor states are not mass eigenstates.

As already observed, this implies that we cannot directly compare flavor states at different times. However we can consider the flavor charge operators, defined as $Q_{e/\mu} \equiv \alpha_{e/\mu}^\dagger \alpha_{e/\mu} - \beta_{e/\mu}^\dagger \beta_{e/\mu}$. We then have

$${}_{e,\mu} \langle 0(t) | Q_e | 0(t) \rangle_{e,\mu} = {}_{e,\mu} \langle 0(t) | Q_\mu | 0(t) \rangle_{e,\mu} = 0, \quad (26)$$

$$\langle \nu_e(t) | Q_e | \nu_e(t) \rangle = |\{\alpha_e(t), \alpha_e^\dagger\}|^2 + |\{\beta_e^\dagger(t), \alpha_e^\dagger\}|^2, \quad (27)$$

$$\langle \nu_e(t) | Q_\mu | \nu_e(t) \rangle = |\{\alpha_\mu(t), \alpha_e^\dagger\}|^2 + |\{\beta_\mu^\dagger(t), \alpha_e^\dagger\}|^2. \quad (28)$$

Charge conservation is ensured at any time: $\langle \nu_e(t) | (Q_e + Q_\mu) | \nu_e(t) \rangle = 1$ and the oscillation formula readily follows as

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_e}(\mathbf{k}, t) &= \left| \left\{ \alpha_{\mathbf{k},e}^r(t), \alpha_{\mathbf{k},e}^{r\dagger} \right\} \right|^2 + \left| \left\{ \beta_{-\mathbf{k},e}^{r\dagger}(t), \alpha_{\mathbf{k},e}^{r\dagger} \right\} \right|^2 \\
&= 1 - \sin^2(2\theta) \left[|U_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 \sin^2 \left(\frac{\omega_{k,2} - \omega_{k,1}}{2} t \right) + |V_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 \sin^2 \left(\frac{\omega_{k,2} + \omega_{k,1}}{2} t \right) \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{\nu_e \rightarrow \nu_\mu}(\mathbf{k}, t) &= \left| \left\{ \alpha_{\mathbf{k},\mu}^r(t), \alpha_{\mathbf{k},e}^{r\dagger} \right\} \right|^2 + \left| \left\{ \beta_{-\mathbf{k},\mu}^{r\dagger}(t), \alpha_{\mathbf{k},e}^{r\dagger} \right\} \right|^2 \\
&= \sin^2(2\theta) \left[|U_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 \sin^2 \left(\frac{\omega_{k,2} - \omega_{k,1}}{2} t \right) + |V_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 \sin^2 \left(\frac{\omega_{k,2} + \omega_{k,1}}{2} t \right) \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

This result is exact. There are two differences with respect to the usual formula for neutrino oscillations: the amplitudes are energy dependent, and there is an additional oscillating term. For $|\mathbf{k}| \gg \sqrt{m_1 m_2}$, $|U_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 \rightarrow 1$ and $|V_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 \rightarrow 0$ and the traditional oscillation formula is recovered. However, also in this case we have that the neutrino state remains a coherent state, thus phenomenological implications of our analysis are possible also for relativistic neutrinos. Further work in this direction is in progress.

This work is partially supported by MURST, INFN, and by a network supported by the European Science Foundation.

REFERENCES

- [1] H.Fritzsch and Z.Z.Xing, *Phys.Rev.***D57** (1998) 594; *Phys.Lett.***B413** (1997) 396
- [2] S.M.Bilenky and B.Pontecorvo, *Phys.Rep.* **41** (1978) 225
- [3] R.Mohapatra and P.Pal, *Massive Neutrinos in Physics and Astrophysics*, (World Scientific, Singapore, 1991)
J.N.Bahcall, *Neutrino Astrophysics*, (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1989)
- [4] H.Umezawa, *Advanced Field Theory: Micro, Macro and Thermal Physics* (American Institute of Physics, New York, 1993)
P.A.Henning, *Phys. Rep.* **253** (1995) 235
- [5] M.Blasone and G.Vitiello, *Ann.Phys. (N.Y.)* **244** (1995) 283
E.Alfinito, M.Blasone, A.Iorio and G.Vitiello, *Phys.Lett.* **B362** (1995) 91
- [6] M.Blasone, P.A.Henning and G.Vitiello, in *Results and Perspectives in Particle Physics*, M.Greco Ed., INFN Frascati 1996, p.139
- [7] T.Kaneko, Y.Ohnuki and K.Watanabe, *Prog. Theor.Phys.* **30** (1963) 521
K.Fujii, *Il Nuovo Cimento* **34** (1964) 722
K.Fujii, C.Habe and T.Yabuki, hep-ph/9807266
- [8] C.Giunti, C.W.Kim, J.A.Lee and U.W.Lee, *Phys. Rev.***D48** (1993) 4310
J.Rich, *Phys. Rev.***D48** (1993) 4318
E.Sassaroli, hep-ph/9710239; hep-ph/9609476